



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Darko Pervan

Application No.: 09/714,514

Filing Date: November 17, 2000

Title: LOCKING SYSTEM AND FLOORING BOARD

Group Art Unit: 3637

Examiner: Phi Dieu Tran A

Confirmation No.: 5020

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

☐ A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.

☐ Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the ☐ \$65.00 (2814) ☐ \$130.00 (1814) fee per
Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.

☐ Also enclosed is/are _____

☐ Small entity status is hereby claimed.

☐ Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the
☐ \$395.00 (2801) ☐ \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).

☐ Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments not be entered.
Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above.

☐ Applicant(s) previously submitted _____

_____ on _____,
for which continued examination is requested.

☐ Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least _____,
which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R.
§ 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.

☐ A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also
enclosed.

- ☒ No additional claim fee is required.
- ☐ An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$50.00 (1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims		MINUS =	0	x \$200.00 (1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)					
Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0.00

- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.
- ☐ Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.
- ☐ Charge _____ to credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: April 12, 2005

By


Jeffrey G. Kilian
Registration No. 50,891

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Patent Application of)
)
)

Darko Pervan)

Group Art Unit: 3637)

Application No.: 09/714,514)

Examiner: Phi Dieu Tran A)

Filed: November 17, 2000)

Confirmation No.: 5020)

For: LOCKING SYSTEM AND)
FLOORING BOARD)
)

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application.
However, in view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1-14 and 16-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,486, hereinafter *Moriau et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,349,796, hereinafter *Meyerson*. The Examiner appears to serially list all of the elements from claims 1-14 and 16-34 in paragraph 2 beginning on page 2 of the Official Action. The format used by the Examiner makes it difficult to appreciate which elements belong to which claims. The following remarks relate to the rejection as it is understood.

Initially, Applicant notes that the Examiner appears to be confusing the portion of the locking system that vertically locks the two joint edges with the portions of the locking system which horizontally locks the joint edges. Specifically, turning to lines 2-8 of claim 1, as recited on page 2 of the response filed on October 18, 2004, Applicant submits that the tongue and groove are identified for "vertical locking of